



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:) Attorney Docket No. 6161.0086.US
Tae-Kyuong KANG) Art Unit: 2879
Application No.: 09/842,857) Examiner: LEURIG, Sharlene L.
Filed: April 27, 2001) Confirmation No. 8680
For: **BASE PANEL HAVING**)
PARTITION AND PLASMA)
DISPLAY DEVICE UTILIZING)
THE SAME)

RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

*Enclosed
response
sent*
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

8/21/04
While Applicant does not disagree with the Examiner's determination that the inventions recited in the claims are patentable over the references of record, Applicant objects to the reasons for allowance (RFA) as being inaccurate and confusing. For example, the RFA is vague and confusing I n its attempt to provide, in one sentence, a statement allegedly applicable to three different sets of independent claims, i.e., claims 3, 8, 10 and 21, which contain different language and define separate inventions. Indeed, each of the claims in this application define separate inventions, which recite different combinations of features, and the basis for the patentability of each claim is based upon the claim limitations from different claims renders the RFA vague and indefinite, and possibly subject to interpretations not anticipated by the Examiner or the Applicant. Moreover, while Applicant believes that the claims are allowable, Applicant does not